



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*dw*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,780	01/26/2004	John C. Anthes	AL01647K	9753
24265	7590	06/20/2007	EXAMINER	
SCHERING-PLOUGH CORPORATION			KANTAMNENI, SHOBHA	
PATENT DEPARTMENT (K-6-1, 1990)			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2000 GALLOPING HILL ROAD			1617	
KENILWORTH, NJ 07033-0530			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/20/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/764,780	ANTHES ET AL.	
	Examiner Shobha Kantamneni	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 01/26/2004, which claims benefit of 60/443,207 filed on 01/28/2003. Claims 1-19 are pending.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 :

- I. Claims 1-12, drawn to a method for treating a condition characterized by airway inflammation comprising administering one or more histamine H3 receptor antagonists, one or more histamine H4 receptor antagonists and optionally one or more histamine H1 receptor antagonists, classified in class 514, subclass 826.
- II. Claims 13-19, drawn to a combination comprising one or more histamine H3 receptor antagonists in association with one or more histamine H4 receptor antagonists and optionally in association with one or more histamine H1 receptor antagonists, and a pharmaceutical composition comprising said combination classified in class 514, subclass 183, 277, 385.

Inventions I, and II are related as process of use and product. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of

using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case clozapine is used to treat schizophrenia.

Each above product, and method of using the product relates to a separate and distinct area of pharmaceutical technology. Also each group listed above involves compositions made from compounds which are recognized in the art as being distinct because of their diverse chemical structure and properties. The search for all inventions would place an undue burden on the office in view of the diversity of compositions, method of using the composition and the corresponding diversity in the field of search for each. Note that the search involves both the patent and non-patent literature.

Further, a search for the invention of the groups I and II would not be coextensive because a search indicating the method is novel or unobvious would not extend to a holding that the product itself is novel or unobvious; similarly, a search indicating that the product is known or would have been obvious would not extend to a holding that the method is known or would have been obvious. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the office if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one or more claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35

U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

### **Election of Species**

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect

- 1) A single disclosed histamine H3 receptor antagonist as in claims 2, and 14
- 2) A single disclosed dual histamine H3/H4 receptor antagonist as in claims 3, and 15
- 3) A single disclosed histamine H1 receptor antagonist as in claims 4, and 16.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition these species are not obvious variants for each other based on the current record.

If applicant elects groups I or II, applicant is further required to elect a single disclosed histamine H3 receptor antagonist, a single disclosed dual histamine H3/H4 receptor antagonist, and a single disclosed histamine H1 receptor antagonist.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. For example, histamine H3 receptor

antagonist thioperamide is structurally distinct from clozapine; dual H3/H4 receptor antagonist with a benzene ring, structure 1 in claim 3 is structurally distinct from a H3/H4 receptor antagonist with a pyridine ring, structure 3 in claim 3; histamine H1 receptor antagonist, astemizole is structurally distinct from triprolidine, and come under different classification.

The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C.112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to the applicant's agent to request an oral election was not made. See M.P.E.P Sec. 812.01.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shobha Kantamneni whose telephone number is 571-272-2930. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Tuesday, Thursday-Friday between 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shobha Kantamneni  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1617



SREENI PADMANABHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER